



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/808,263	03/14/2001	Peter H. Golde	777.414US1	3366
41505	7590	12/22/2004	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			HOANG, PHUONG N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*Supplemental*  
**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/808,263

Applicant(s)

GOLDE ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2126

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1 - 87.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: Examiner made a mistake on the last advisory action, sent on 10/12/04. The after final amendment was sent within two months from the final office action which was mailed on 06/15/04.

*11 attached interview summary*

  
PHUONG N. HOANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued in substance that (1). Hejlsberg does not teach an delegate object containing a pointer to a method, as well as a pointer to an object that referenced method to be applied as to claim 1.

(2). There is no motivation to combine the system of Brumme and Hejlsberg.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with applicant's remark.

As to point 1, examiner does not see anywhere in claim 1 that a delegate containing a pointer that referenced method. Applicant brought the specification and argued for the claim. If examiner has to put the limitation in the claim to be considered. Reference does not only means referring by pointers. Even applicant did not claim the delegate containing a pointer. Hejlsberg also teaches a delegate object containing a pointer to method (method pointer allowing a developer/user to achieve delegation between objects....object, abstract and col. 3 lines 65 - col. 4 lines 40, col. 7 lines 65 - col. 8, col. 9 lines 55 - 65, and col. 13 lines 50 - 55).

As to claim 2, Brumme teaches an object model having methods for intergrating objects wherein objects can invokes method to call another object, and Hejlsberg relied on the features of using delegate object to invoke a method, not the whole system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brumme and Hejlsberg's features because Hejlsberg's delegation would provide an assignment to invoke a method and easy for the user to control the object behavior.